

# MINING EXTRAORDINARY.

A "Common Cheat" in Earnest.

RECORDS OF A "SCANDALOUS COMPANY."

*The kind of timber Liberal Ministers are made of.*

SUBJECTS FOR REFLECTION BY THE ELECTORS.

Mr. Huntington's personal organ, the *Montreal Herald*, is horrified that respectable people like Mr. M. H. Gault should consent to belong to a party which accepts Mr. Macdougall as one of its leading exponents. It refers to Mr. Macdougall as a "common cheat," and weeps crocodile tears, because "an honourable man like Mr. Gault says he wishes to be promoted into the same brotherhood." There is something very touching in the solicitude on the part of Lucius Seth Huntington's personal organ lest honourable men should become contaminated with persons of questionable character. The case is so remarkable a one, that we are sure our readers will excuse us for examining the claim which Mr. Huntington has thus to refer to gentlemen, who, whatever their failings, are certainly in all respects, morally and intellectually greatly his superior. Let us examine the character of the man, with whom leading Liberals are not only prepared to herd, but whom they have elevated to a position of leadership among them.

It is not necessary to refer at any length to the facts connected with the mining speculations of Lucius Seth Huntington. He was charged by the *GAZETTE* in September, 1874, with being "steeped to the very lips in the most wicked frauds." The result was an action of libel against the proprietors of this journal, on which he claimed \$100,000 damages. Mr. Huntington professed to be very anxious to bring the matter to an issue, and complained, with apparent bitterness, at the delay in pleading. More than eighteen months ago the plea of justification was served upon him, and that has been the last heard of the matter. We cannot therefore, be charged with any impropriety if now we make special reference to the facts contained in that plea of justification. As to the Huntington Mine, the charge made was that the statements in the prospectus were, within the knowledge of Mr. Huntington, in large measure untrue. And when it is mentioned that one of the statements made was to the effect that "in six months the Huntington Mine could be put into condition

21  
F5012  
1878  
C754

"to raise and ship two thousand tons of ore, selected up to six per cent., at a monthly profit of six thousand pounds sterling"—that is, an annual profit of seventy-two thousand pounds sterling; when it is mentioned that the statement was made that "the profits, apart from the manufacture of alkali and bleaching powder, show a return of forty-five per cent. on the capital proposed to be called up, but this may be greatly increased by the further opening out of the mines"—when, as a matter of fact, the mines had been a losing concern all the time; and when other facts to which we shall make reference presently and which have not up to this time been commented upon in Canada are considered, it will be admitted that the charge made against him was fully warranted.

As to the Copper Pyrites Company, the facts, as stated in the plea of justification to which Mr. Huntington has not up to this time thought it worth while to reply, are that he deliberately lied in the prospectus in order that he might more effectively swindle the Glasgow public. Our readers will remember that the property put in this company consisted of seventeen distinct lots, the names, with the acreage and price, being included in the prospectus. The acreage was stated at 10,912 acres, and the price \$839,800. It was claimed that these lots had been "secured under the influence of the depression which has ruled for years past in the copper trade, and before the mining excitement had reached Canada." And then we had this remarkable statement in the prospectus, than which nothing could be more untrue in fact:—"The above are the *bona fide* prices which are to be paid by the present vendors" (that is Huntington and McEwen) "to the Canadian proprietors. In acquiring these properties considerable outlay had to

be incurred by the vendors, and they had to make large advances on account of the purchase moneys. The directors have, therefore, agreed, over and above the prices payable to Canadian proprietors, to pay to the vendors the sum of £15,000 for expenses incurred in Canada in securing the properties and commissions paid Canadian agents, and also a premium of £35,000, WHICH IS TO INCLUDE ALL CHARGES FOR PROMOTION."

Thus the people of Glasgow were pressed to subscribe on the ground that they were getting the properties at an extraordinarily low price; that the vendors were putting them in at their actual cost, at a time of severe depression, and that, therefore, the scheme must be a valuable one, WHILE AS A MATTER OF FACT THE PRICE ACTUALLY PAID FOR THESE PROPERTIES WAS \$323,000 LESS THAN THE SUM STATED IN THE PROSPECTUS, THE UNFORTUNATE INVESTOR BEING SWINDLED AT THE VERY OUTSET TO THE EXTENT OF THIS LARGE SUM. That of course is irrespective of the fact that many of the properties have since turned out to be absolutely valueless as mining lands. Here is the summing up on this point of the plea of justification put in by the publishers of THE GAZETTE to Mr. Huntington's claim for damages:—

"That by means of the aforesaid contrivances and mis-representations the said plaintiff succeeded in imposing upon the said two Companies, properties in Canada by him represented to be of the value of above one and a half millions of dollars; out of which the plaintiff himself received the greater part of the sum of £125,000 sterling, equal to about \$625,000, for the said Huntington Mine; and at least the sum of \$323,000 out of the prices of the properties sold to the Canada Copper Pyrites and Chemical Company, making in all a sum of \$950,000 or thereabouts, in addition to the bonus and allowances of £35,000 and £15,000 sterling, equal to about \$250,000, agreed to by the said Company which being so added form the total sum of \$1,200,000 received by said plaintiff and his said

ers, and they  
es on account  
The directors  
ver and above  
Canadian pro-  
venders the  
expenses in-  
curring the pro-  
paid Canadian  
um of £35,000,  
CLUDE ALL  
PROMOTION."  
y were pressed  
and that they  
s at an extra-  
t the vendors  
their actual cost,  
sion, and that,  
t be a valuable  
ER OF FACT  
PAID FOR  
AS \$323,000  
STATED IN  
E UNFORTU-  
G SWINDLED  
TO THE EX-  
E SUM. That  
ctive of the  
he properties  
be absolutely  
n. Here is the  
of the plea of  
ne publishers of  
Huntington's claim

foresaid contriv-  
tions the said  
g upon the said  
n Canada by him  
lue of above one  
s; out of which  
the greater part  
equal to about  
ton Mine; and at  
t of the prices of  
Canada Copper  
any, making in  
or thereabouts,  
and allowances  
ing, equal to  
e said Company  
the total sum of  
ntiff and his said

associate. AND THAT IN LESS THAN TWO YEARS FROM THE TIME OF THE FORMATION OF THE SAID TWO COMPANIES, THE STOCKHOLDER THEREIN, BY REASON OF THE FALSE REPRESENTATIONS OF THE SAID PLAINTIFF AND THE COMPARATIVE WORTHLESSNESS OF THE SAID MINES AND MINING PROPERTIES, SUSTAINED A LOSS OF \$340,000 STERLING, IN THE CURRENT AND ORDINARY VALUE OF THEIR SHARES THEREOF, EQUAL TO \$1,200,000. That since the said period the said depression has continued and greatly increased. And that the whole of the said mining properties, including the said Huntington Mine, are unremunerative, are practically worthless, and now represent but a small fraction of the original nominal value paid for them by the *bona fide* stockholders thereof."

Recent investigations have shown that the swindle involved in these transactions was even more barefaced than has been supposed. In the prospectus of the Huntington Mining Company is the following passage:—"The purchase money to be paid for the mines is £125,000. This includes the whole working plant, steam-engines, water wheels, crushing mills, and dressing machinery, offices, dwelling houses, AND ABOUT 5,000 ACRES OF FREEHOLD LAND IN THE SAME TOWNSHIP, A GREAT PART OF WHICH IS HEAVILY TIMBERED—all of which will be valuable for the purposes of the mine and for fuel. THESE LANDS, THOUGH LITTLE EXPLORED, ARE KNOWN TO CONTAIN MINERALS, AND MAY THEREFORE BECOME A VALUABLE ASSET OF THE COMPANY." In the investigations which have been taking place within the last few months, as to the real value of the assets of the Company, the character of these five thousand acres of land has been carefully examined. One of the oldest land surveyors in the Townships, a gentleman of the highest character and respectability, was employed to explore and report from this "valuable asset of the Company." His report has the endorsement of two gentlemen, one

resident in Magog and one in Bolton, who are well known political friends of Mr. Huntington, and whose perfect competency to judge of the value of such lands even he would hardly venture to dispute. THEY VALUE THESE FIVE THOUSAND ACRES OF LAND AT ABOUT \$4,000, AND WITH THE CRUSHER, THE MILL AND WATER POWER, ON THE PROPERTY, THE VALUE AS AN ASSET IS ESTIMATED AT NOT OVER NINE THOUSAND DOLLARS! What does the reader think was the sum charged by Mr. Huntington for this property when selling it to the Glasgow people? NO LESS THAN £10,800 STERLING, OR FORTY-NINE DOLLARS AN ACRE, SHOWING A CLEAR SWINDLE IN THIS TRANSACTION ALONE TO THE EXTENT OF NEARLY A QUARTER OF A MILLION OF DOLLARS! At a meeting of the Huntington Copper and Sulphur Company, held in Glasgow on the 27th of June last, and reported in the *North British Mail* of the 28th June, Mr. Gray, one of the directors, who had been in Canada, made a statement, from which we quote as follows:—

"Mr. Andrew R. Gray reported that at the request of the directors he had visited the mine in Canada. He had only returned three days ago, and had not had time to prepare a moral report for the meeting. He had acquired very valuable information regarding their property and its history, but it had not yet been submitted to his co-directors, and it therefore appeared to him to be somewhat premature in the present circumstances to lay the information before the meeting. He would, however, be glad to answer any question if he could do so without injuring themselves as a company. He had visited all their property that was accessible to ordinary persons like himself (laughter) AND IT WOULD NO DOUBT SURPRISE MANY OF THEM TO KNOW THAT WHAT WAS DESIGNATED AS VALUABLE, HEAVY TIMBERED LAND, FOR WHICH THEY PAID \$47 PER ACRE, CONSISTED OF SWAMP AND HIGH ROCK, AND WAS TRULY DESCRIBED IN THE GOVERNMENT RECORDS AS WASTE LANDS. (Laughter.) He had gone through

all the workings of the mine, and it was only too evident that but a small portion of the 2,000 tons per month which were provided in their prospectus could be obtained notwithstanding all the expense they had been at in opening it up."

That is the statement of a gentleman who had just returned to England from Canada, and it is an additional proof of the character of this transaction.

One feature of this transaction is worthy of special mention. In the case of the Huntington mine, nominally owned by a Company, Mr. Huntington's plea is that he simply gave the information obtained from experts, and was not in any way responsible for its accuracy. It is known that this plea is a false one; that some of the statements made in the prospectus related to features concerning which Mr. Huntington had full knowledge and the assertions in relation to which he knew to be untrue. But there's no excuse in the matter of these five thousand acres of land. HE KNEW THESE TO BE PRACTICALLY VALUELESS! HE KNEW THAT THEY WERE ON RECORD IN THE CROWN LANDS OFFICE AS WASTE LANDS! AND HE KNEW, MOREOVER, THAT SOME OF THEM HAD ACTUALLY BEEN SOLD AT ABOUT ONE CENT AN ACRE! AND YET HE, ACTING IN THE DOUBLE CAPACITY OF VENDOR AND TRUSTEE FOR THE PURCHASERS, DELIBERATELY PUT THEM INTO THE CONCERN AT NEARLY A QUARTER OF A MILLION OF DOLLARS IN EXCESS OF THEIR VALUE, WAS ABLE TO POCKET THE INFAMOUS PLUNDER THUS OBTAINED FROM UNSUSPECTING DUPES!

It is claimed by Mr. Huntington that in the case of the Copper Pyrites Company, the suit brought against him has been withdrawn, and that a letter of apology for anything which may have appeared to reflect upon his personal character, has been voted to him by the Directors of the Company. That was

his defence, delivered in his most sonorous tones, in the House of Commons last session. One wonders at the bold effrontery of a man who can put forward such a defence. It is true that the suit has been withdrawn; but it cost Mr. Huntington and his associates a pretty round penny to secure its withdrawal. MR. HUNTINGTON HIMSELF PAID FORTY THOUSAND DOLLARS TO ATTAIN THAT OBJECT. IT WAS ATTAINED BY THE ORIGINAL PROMOTERS BUYING IN THE SHARES AT THEIR REDUCED FIGURE, OBTAINING IN THAT WAY A CONTROLLING INTEREST, ELECTING THEIR OWN DIRECTORS, AND THEN WITH DRAWING, WITH A FLOURISH OF TRUMPETS, THE SUIT AGAINST THEMSELVES! It is true that any single shareholder could still take an action. But it is not surprising that no one has yet done this, for the reason that he would have to fight the battle with his own money against the Company, backed by the money of the shareholders.

The same game that was played, and so far successfully played in connection with the Copper Pyrites Company, is now attempted to be played with the Huntington Mining Company. Mr. Huntington evidently understands the game. He treats with the most magnificent indifference all suits brought against him, and simply watches and aids the manipulations by which the prosecution is bought off. In this case, as in the other, the original directors, although but victims of the falsehoods of Mr. Huntington and his immediate associates, are still in law liable, and they are naturally anxious to prevent any further prosecution of suits which must inevitably tend not only to their pecuniary loss, but to the lessening of the prestige which they originally enjoyed with their fellow countrymen. At the meeting to which we

have referred, as having been held in Glasgow on the 27th June, Sir James Bain, who has had a painful experience in connection with this business, and who would do almost anything to see the end of it, made a strong appeal in favour of stopping the suit, and a resolution in this direction, in amendment to the report, was adopted. This proceeding has aroused a strong feeling. At an adjourned meeting held on the 25th July last, an appeal was made to have the question reopened, but upon the technical ground that the meeting had only been adjourned to consider the accounts of the Company, the Chairman choked off discussion. The result has been the issue of the following circular, signed by a number of the present directors, and which lets a flood of light in upon the method adopted to secure a repetition of the game played in the case of the Copper Pyrites Company by the withdrawal of the suit:—

149 PORT STREET, }  
Glasgow, 13th August, 1878. }

*To the Shareholders of the Huntington Copper and Sulphur Company, Limited:*

GENTLEMEN,—We beg to request your special attention to the fact that the extraordinary general meeting, referred to in the accompanying notice is called for the express purpose of obtaining, by means of voting power, the withdrawal of the action presently pending at the instance of the Company against the original Directors and the vendors of the mine.

The object of that action is to reduce and set aside the purchase of the mine, and to recover from the defenders the sum of £150,000 sterling. The grounds of action are fully detailed in the condescendence lodged for the Company, and being already well-known to the shareholders it is unnecessary at present to refer further to them.

A committee of investigation was appointed by the shareholders at their general meeting, held on 30th July, 1875. The committee in December, 1875, reported fully the result of their investigations, and subsequently the shareholders in general meeting, held on 24th July, 1877, unanimously instructed the Directors to raise the action referred to.

We are decidedly of opinion that the true interests of the independent shareholders will be sacrificed if the resolution referred to in the requisition is carried, and we feel

bound to use all legitimate means to defeat its object. Much additional and valuable information has been obtained since the institution of the action, all tending towards the Company's ultimate success. That success, however, depends in a great measure on the cordial support and co-operation of the independent shareholders, and it is scarcely necessary for us to point out that the successful prosecution of the action will result in the recovery by the Company for distribution amongst the shareholders of a sum greatly in excess of what they can possibly realise by disposing of their shares.

It is a significant fact that all the shares held by the requisitionists, except two, whose holdings are trifling, have been acquired by them since May, 1877, and not only so, but that the voting power represented by the original directors and their friends, including the requisitionists, at the ordinary annual general meeting of the shareholders, held on 27th June, 1878, was 8,883 shares, of which above 7,600 were acquired after May, 1877, by which time the defenders had come to know that we were determined to vindicate the just rights of the independent shareholders. The voting power thus acquired, although undoubtedly very great, will not suffice for the attainment of the defenders' purpose if the independent shareholders are united in their determination to have the questions at issue settled on their merits. It will be recollected that at the meeting referred to an attempt was made to get quit of the action. The failure of the attempt then was no doubt the cause of another meeting being called now. If the defenders really felt the confidence they profess in the justice of their defence, they ought, we think, to court rather than evade judicial enquiry.

Feeling the vital importance of the vote at the meeting, we urgently request that you use every endeavour to be present, and that whether you intend being present or not, you will without fail sign the enclosed proxy in favour of Mr. James Wright, the Chairman, and Mr. W. A. Smith, a Director of the Company, and send it by return of post to the Secretary. We have no personal interest to serve in this matter, but we cannot too strongly repeat our conviction that justice will not be done either to the shareholders or to the defenders themselves if the resolution is passed.

The proxy requires to be signed by yourself, and your signature to be attested by *one witness* at least, the law in regard to such proxies being different from railway proxies, which require no witness.

We are,

Your obdt. servants,  
JAMES WRIGHT, Chairman,  
WM. LOWSON, Director,  
ANDREW G. GRAY, Director,  
WM. ALEX. SMITH, Director.



P.S.—The following extract from Lord Young's decision requiring Mr. Henderson, one of the defenders, to pay to the Company £10,000 promotion money he received from the vendors is worthy of your perusal. The shareholders will recollect that all the original directors, with the exception of Mr. Wilson, received promotion money as well as Mr. Henderson whose £10,000 Lord Deas said, could not, "be called by any other name than that of a bribe."

[EXTRACT FROM LORD YOUNG'S DECISION.]

"I regard the case as a very clear and even gross case for the application of a familiar and well settled rule of law. And with respect to the remedy (which I have here given to the extent asked), I desire to say that I am not of opinion that the law affords no larger and more complete remedy than depriving the trustee of the profits which he has personally made. If a private individual should discover that his factor or agent had betrayed him into the purchase of a property, effected on his advice and through his instrumentality, in pursuance of a secret agreement with the seller to share that price with him, I am not of opinion that the remedy is confined to compelling such factor or agent to give up so much of the price as he had received. On the contrary, I incline as at present advised to think that any one who discovers that he has thus been defrauded may, if so minded, repudiate the purchase altogether, and seek complete redress against both the seller who seduced his agent and the agent who faithlessly yielded to the seduction. A Company is in no different position with respect to its directors; and if it should appear that a party having property to sell tempted the directors of a Company by personal bribery to buy it for the Company, I cannot permit myself to doubt that the Company might, on discovering the fraud, repudiate the transaction and seek complete redress against all concerned in it."

In addition to that, the following circular has also been issued to the shareholders:—

"No. 1 Threadneedle Street, London, E.C., 23rd July, 1878.—Dear Sir,—Being a small shareholder of the Huntington Copper and Sulphur Company, and representing several others, I, some days ago, in Glasgow, met the present director, and had a full exposition from them of their contest with the old directors, with a careful and confidential discussion of the means to be used for securing the interests of the *bona fide* shareholders. It would be unwise to publish details, but I think what follows should be known to you, viz:—1. The present directors are seriously and firmly de-

termined to proceed with the action raised by order of the shareholders against the old directors and promoters of this company, and declare themselves satisfied that they will succeed, if supported by the shareholders. 2. The majority at the recent meeting was procured by means almost or altogether unprecedented, namely—by the wholesale purchase of shares which have been registered in the names of the relatives and friends of the old directors. The 86 proxies in support of the old directors represented 1888 shares. Of these, about 650 were held by these old directors themselves, and only about ten others, holding scarcely 550 shares in all, held any of them prior to May, 1877. The others, above 70 in number, holding about 7688 shares, have bought their shares, or had these put into their names since that time, and in lots almost uniformly of 100 shares each, so as to magnify their voting power. It is curious, and can scarcely be accidental, that in this short period nine Mortons (besides your old director of that name) should have thought fit to acquire exactly 100 shares each; besides two Hendersons and two Bains, another Bain getting only twenty shares—all besides the old directors of these names. Some other names are also similarly repeated for 100 shares each. All this is very odd, and suggests that these people must have some joint, special and strong reasons for acting in exactly the same way; and that the other people who sold them those shares should have kept their shares. Unless some considerable profit was to be made or some heavy payment avoided by purchasing these shares, they would not have been so widely and uniformly bought by so many well-informed people. These independent shareholders who have kept their shares may still look for that large profit or payment. The object of those who directed the movement has evidently been to acquire a majority of voice, and so to control the company's proceedings and funds, stop the action, and get the command of the considerable sum of money now lying in your bank account, about £11,000, with which a long defence against your past claims may be carried on at your expense. Your directors being taken unawares at the recent meeting, were not ready with these singular facts, which have been learned from a return which I requested the directors to procure. But no statement or argument would have lessened the effect of the proxies from this carefully created body of shareholders. In presence of such unprecedented proceedings, it seems to be the duty and interest of every independent shareholder to support the present directors, and to refuse to sell shares which are still being sought for. By holding them firm, and sticking together, the independent shareholders will doubtless obtain

a very great deal more than by selling. You cannot doubt the opinion which a jury will form of the proceedings above described. Almost all the independent voters—those who held shares before May, 1877—either supported the present directors at last meeting or remained inactive, neglecting to vote. The number of these shareholders not voting is considerably greater than the number who sent votes for either side. If next time they send their votes promptly to the present directors, they will be far more than sufficient to defeat even the huge artificial phalanx of the new shareholders who have given their names to support the original directors and promoters OF THIS SCANDALOUS COMPANY.

Your obedient servant,

JOHN M. DOUGLAS.

That is a good name "Scandalous Company." That it should be applied to a Company promoted by a Canadian Minister of the Crown, is a matter for shame and humiliation to every honest Canadian.

But Mr. Huntington whines to his friends, declaring that all this is a mere matter of political persecution got up on this side of the water, as a punishment to him for having moved the Pacific Scandal resolutions. His statement last session was that he had never heard a complaint of the matter from the shareholders or directors, until after it had been mentioned in the House of Commons by Sir John Macdonald. That such a statement should be made is proof of the tremendous confidence of this man Huntington is the gullability of his political friends. It is surely too much that the people of Glasgow, subscribers to this "scandalous Company," should be supposed to be so much interested in the success of the Canadian Conservative party, as to have got up all this indignation and submitted to all this serious loss, simply to help Sir John A. Macdonald. HERE, HOWEVER, IS THE PROOF THAT MR. HUNTINGTON WAS GUILTY OF DELIBERATE FALSEHOOD WHEN HE STATED THAT HE HAD HEARD NOTHING OF ANY COMPLAINTS UNTIL AF-

TER HE HAD MADE HIS CHARGES IN PARLIAMENT. Those charges were made in April, 1873, and yet in November, 1872, six months before the charges were heard of, he was answering complaints as follows:—

MONTREAL, November 14th, 1872.

J. R. Cunningham, Jr., Esq.

DEAR SIR,—I have the honor to acknowledge your letter of the 2nd instant, enclosing extracts from Mr. Taylor's letters, and I note the request of the Directors that they may hear from me (first) as to the American tariff and (secondly) as to my representations as vendor and discrepancies suggested by Mr. Taylor's report. As to the American tariff on phosphates, I did not at the time of the sale know what it was, and there is, I think, strong reason to hope that it will soon be modified, both as to phosphates and copper. At the present moment copper smelting in the Eastern States has been almost abandoned, but in former years I sent large quantities to Baltimore, on which the purchasers paid half the United States duties as value for the sulphur in the ores.

Secondly. As to the discrepancies between the descriptions of the properties and the facts I do not think Mr. Taylor intended to convey the idea that any existed. He wrote at the first blush and (as I know for the first time from your letter) did not take a sanguine view of what he saw. Mr. Taylor is now in the West, and I think it would be unseemly for me to enter into controversial discussion of his statements at this early stage. I have no hesitation in stating that there will be found no serious discrepancies between the representations of the vendors and existing facts, and I have no doubt that Mr. Taylor's reports from time to time will prove this amply.

The Directors will observe that Mr. McEwen and myself were only nominally vendors. WE MERELY UNDERTOOK TO CONVEY TO THE COMPANY THE PROPERTIES FOR WHICH WE HAD TAKEN OPTIONS AT THE PRICES WE HAD AGREED TO PAY, NOT BECAUSE WE WERE MAKING MONEY BY IT, BUT BECAUSE SOMEBODY HAD TO TAKE THE POSITION OF VENDORS IN THE CONTRACT. We gave you, moreover, all the knowledge we had ourselves, viz., that acquired from skilled and reliable engineers. You have thus acquired a vast property worth immeasurably more than you had paid for it, consisting, as you had stated in your prospectus, of properties, "some well developed and others showing indications of great promise."

Very truly yours,

(Signed) L. S. HUNTINGTON.

We have already shown that so far from its being true that Mr. Huntington made no money, HE AND HIS ASSOCIATE MADE OVER THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS IMPROPERLY ON THIS TRANSACTION. But this letter is the answer to the statement that no complaints were made until after he had moved his Pacific scandal resolutions. But as to how his conduct was viewed in England even by his brother directors, may be estimated from the following extract from a letter from one of those directors dated 26th December, 1873:

"A very remarkable and suspicious affair, which, I think, has been now mentioned to you for the first time, and which to me, probably more than to the other directors, except McEwen, shows me the mind of Huntington all through this affair. Each of the Directors put their names down for 1,000 shares, signed their applications, paid their deposits and calls—all except Huntington. He never applied for shares. McEwen did for him, but Huntington never signed the letter of application, he is not legally even a shareholder, and much less a Director. To all the secretary's applications for calls, he has never answered a word nor acknowledged himself a shareholder. We refused to give up the £50,000 fully paid shares to McEwen unless these calls were paid, and the end of it all was that, to save the company, I had to purchase 1,000 shares from McEwen, £8 paid for £1 a share, and now hold nearly 5,000 shares, mostly bought up from people—friends in distress. I AM QUITE CLEAR THAT HUNTINGTON ALL ALONG KNEW THAT IT WAS A GROSS SWINDLE, AND KEPT CLEAR OF THE SHARES. HE HAS FULLY NEVER BEEN A SHAREHOLDER, AND HAS CRUELLY FLEECE US. AND THIS IS THE MAN WHO SETS UP FOR THE SIMON PURE OF CANADA! SOME PEOPLE SAY THE JOHN BRIGHT OF CANADA. YOU

AND I, AND EVERY ONE WHO HAS ANY HONESTY OF PURPOSE, SHOULD BEND ALL OUR ENERGIES TO EXPOSE SUCH A MAN."

We submit these facts for the information of our readers, and especially for the information of Mr. Huntington's personal organ. We ask them what they think of a newspaper, which not only supports, but is said to be partly owned by the hero of these "Scandalous Companies," venturing to apply the term "COMMON CHEAT" to any public man in Canada.

Mr. Huntington was able to float these "scandalous companies" because of his position as a public man in Canada. Sir James Bain, in his defence of his own participation in the matter, at the meeting on the 27th June last, expressly stated that it was the information obtained from a Canadian house in Glasgow that Mr. Huntington was "a member of the Canadian Parliament," that among other things led him to embark in it, and to give the influence of his name. This man, therefore, whom the Liberal party in Canada delight to honor, was guilty not only of a miserable fraud and swindle, but he was guilty of prostituting the position which he held as a public man in this country, the better to enable him to do it. He is swelling it to-day with the importance of his ill-gotten wealth; but if there is a just Heaven above us, the wails and miseries of widows and orphans, tempted to put all they had into their "scandalous companies," in the hope of large returns lyingly promised them, must sooner or later be avenged.